

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

### **CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claim 1 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Responsive to this, claim 1 is amended according to the Examiner's instructions. Therefore, it is believed that, by the amendments, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph should be removed.

### **CLAIM OBJECTION**

Claim 9 was originally objected to because of some informalities.

Responsive to this, claim 9 is amended according to the Examiner's instruction and suggestion, and it is believed that the objections should be removed.

### **CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)**

Claims 1, 4-5 and 13 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamura (US-5,558,570).

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claim 2-3, 6-12 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Responsive to this, claim 2 is deleted, and claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1 and 2 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art reference cited by the Examiner. In addition, claim 3 is also deleted.

Accordingly, by the amendments, it is believed that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn, and the amended claim 1 should be allowable.

It is further submitted that the claims 4-14 should be allowable as they are dependent upon the amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

Charles E. Baxley

Attorney for Applicant

90 John Street, Third Floor

New York, N.Y. 10038-3243

Telephone 212-791-7200

Facsimile 212-791-7276